# REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-26, 28-34, and 36-38 are pending in the application before the present amendments to the claims. Claims 1-6, 8-26, 28-34, and 36-38 stand rejected. The rejections are addressed herein in the order they appear in the Office Action dated 24 June 2008.

## Claim Amendments

Claims 1 and 38 are amended. Support is found, for example, in FIG. 9. Claims 8-26, 28-34, and 36-37 are canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

## Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claim 38

Claim 38 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,107,298 to Prahlad et al. ("Prahlad") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,136,897 to Raghunandan ("Raghunandan"). As discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that claim 38 is patentable over the cited references.

As amended, Claim 38 recites a method for automatically managing dynamic mailboxes, including:

(1)    obtaining configuration information from one or more dynamic mailboxes;

(2)    purging all expired messages of the dynamic mailboxes; and

(3)    for each dynamic mailbox having a size that exceeds an allocated limit:

archiving only messages of the dynamic mailbox that have not been accessed by a subscriber for a predetermined time period, and

compressing only messages of the dynamic mailbox that have been accessed by a subscriber within the predetermined time period.

Step (3) recites compressing only messages of the dynamic mailbox that have been accessed by a subscriber within the predetermined time period, thereby advantageously limiting compression of messages. In contrast, Raghunandan teaches compressing all incoming email messages after a predetermined available space threshold level has been reached. *See e.g.,*

Raghunandan col. 1, lines 47-48; col. 3, lines 9-13; and FIG. 2. Additionally, step (3) recites compressing messages that are already stored in a dynamic mailbox, while Raghunandan instead teaches compressing incoming email messages before they are stored in a mailbox. *See* e.g., Raghunandan, Abstract; col. 1, lines 47-48; col. 3, lines 9-13; and FIG. 2.

Furthermore, step (3) recites archiving messages of a dynamic mailbox when (a) the dynamic mailbox has a size that exceeds an allocated limit, and (b) the messages have not been accessed by a subscriber for a predetermined time period. However, Prahlad does not teach archiving messages according to both required elements of this two-part criteria.

Accordingly, the combination of Prahlad and Raghunandan does not teach or suggest the method of claim 38. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 38 is patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 38.

Claims 1-5

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,455 to Fortman et al. combined with Prahlad in further view of Raghunandan. Applicants respectfully call the Examiner's attention to the fact that U.S. Patent No. 6,115,455 corresponds to Picard, not Fortman. Applicants assume that the Examiner intended to cite U.S. Patent No. 5,987,100 to Fortman et al. with respect to claims 1-5 because the Examiner cites Fortman throughout the rejection of claims 1-5 and cites Figures that appear in Fortman but do not appear in Picard. Accordingly, Applicants respond as though claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,100 to Fortman et al. ("Fortman") combined with Prahlad in further view of Raghunandan. If this is incorrect, Applicants request the Examiner issue a corrected, non-final office action clarifying the rejection of claims 1-5.

As discussed below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5 and submit that such claims are patentable over the cited references. Claim 1 recites a method for exchanging messages between users, including:

(1) processing messages from a plurality of user networks having a plurality of network protocols, for storage in a message store;

(2) accessing at least one of the messages in the message store from one of the user networks having any one of the network protocols;

(3) obtaining configuration information about a mailbox for organizing at least one of the messages in the message store;

(4) purging all expired messages of the mailbox; and

(5) when the mailbox has a size that exceeds an allocated limit:

archiving only messages of the mailbox that have not been accessed by a subscriber for a predetermined time period, and

compressing only messages of the mailbox that have been accessed by a subscriber within the predetermined time period.

Step (5) recites compressing only messages of the mailbox that have been accessed by a subscriber within the predetermined time period. However, as argued above with respect to claim 38, Raghunandan instead teaches compressing all incoming email messages after a predetermined available space threshold level has been reached. Additionally, step (5) recites compressing messages that are already stored in a mailbox, while Raghunandan teaches compressing incoming email messages before they are stored in a mailbox, as argued above with respect to claim 38.

Furthermore, step (5) recites archiving messages of a mailbox when (a) the mailbox has a size that exceeds an allocated limit, and (b) the messages have not been accessed by a subscriber for a predetermined time period. However, as argued above with respect to claim 38, Prahlad does not teach archiving messages according to both required elements of this two-part criteria.

Accordingly, the combination of Fortman, Prahlad, and Raghunandan does not teach or suggest the method of claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and benefit from like arguments of patentability. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-5 are

patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2-5.

Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected as being unpatenable over Fortman combined with Prahlad and Raghunandan in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,114,455 to Picard ("Picard"). Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and benefits from like arguments of patentability. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6.

Claims 30-34, 36, and 37

Claims 30-34, 36, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Picard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,887 to Joong et al. ("Joong"). Although Applicants do not concede the obviousness of these claims, Applicants cancel these claims in order to expedite prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 30-34, 36, and 37 is moot.

Claims 8-16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 29

Claims 8-16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman in view of Joong. Applicants do not concede the obviousness of these claims. Nevertheless, Applicants cancel these claims in order to expedite prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 8-16, 18, 21, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 is moot.

Claim 22

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Joong in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,524,137 to Rhee. Applicants do not concede the obviousness of this claim. Nevertheless, Applicants cancel this claim in order to expedite prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 22 is moot.

Claim 24

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Joong in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,729 to Kuter et al. Applicants do not concede the obviousness of this claim. Nevertheless, Applicants cancel this claim in order to expedite prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 24 is moot.

Claims 17, 19, and 20

Claims 17, 19, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fortman combined with Joong in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,334 to Zirngibl. Applicants do not concede the obviousness of these claims. Nevertheless, Applicants cancel these claims in order to expedite prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 17, 19, and 20 is moot.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and Remarks, Applicants submit that they have addressed all issues raised in the Office Action dated 24 June 2008, and respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Applicants submit that no fees are due in connection with this Amendment and Response other than a $65 fee for a one month extension of time. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deemed necessary in connection with this Amendment and Response to deposit account 12-0600, referencing the Attorney Docket Number 406293.

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

By: _Philip di Zerega_

Philip diZerega Reg. No. 57,892
4845 Pearl East Circle, Suite 300
Boulder, Colorado 80301
Telephone: (720) 931-3037
Facsimile: (720) 931-3001